

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/913,332

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey C. Mullis

Art Unit

1711

## All Participants:

(1) Jeffrey C. Mullis.

(2) John Bailey.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2004

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*1 6 8*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Jeffrey Mullis  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1711

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' attorney contacted the examiner on 3-19-04 re the status of their after FINAL response. Applicants' attorney was told that the examiner could not respond to the after FINAL until the petition filed by applicants 13 November 2003 was decided and that no decision was evident. Applicants' attorney responded that a favorable decision had indeed been made on their petition and it was agreed that applicant's attorney would FAX a copy of the decision. On 31 March the examiner contacted applicants' attorney to make the changes in the examiners' amendment to claim 1 which contained a typo and to make the changes to claims 6 and 8 so that these claims would have antecedent basis. .